12th December 1938]

(*b*) what " public interests " the Government fear are likely to be affected by the unhampered visits by the said non-officials to girls' schools?

THE HON. DR. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" (*a*) & (*b*) The Government were led to issue G.O. No. 1358, Education, dated 15th June 1938, as a result of allegations made against a certain vice-president of a district board regarding his conduct towards women teachers employed in elementary schools. The orders in the Government Order have since been modified by G.O. No. 2210, Education, dated 16th September 1938, which has been placed at the disposal of the Press."

Government's policy in regard to co-education and visits of non-officials to mixed schools.

* 66 *Q.*—SRI RAO BAHADUR M. RAMAKRISHNA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Education and Legal Departments be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the future policy of Government is regarding co-education and mixed schools;

(*b*) whether the Government are in favour of such co-education;

(*c*) if the Government are in favour of co-education, whether they think that visits of adult non-officials and not presence of boys studying in mixed schools are likely to affect " public interests ";

(*d*) if the Government think that presence of boys is not likely to affect " public interests " at which age of the boys the Government think there will be a necessity for the imposition of restrictions mentioned by the Government Order; and

(*e*) whether the opinion of the Director of Public Instruction was obtained before the passing of the Government Order and if so, whether a copy of the same will be placed on the table?

THE HON. DR. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" (*a*) & (*b*) The policy continues to be the same as it has been. The hon. Member is referred to rule 70 of the Madras Educational Rules.

" (*c*) *to* (*e*) The hon. Member apparently refers to the orders in G.O. No. 1358, Education, dated 15th June 1938. The Government Order has since been modified by G.O. No. 2210, Education, dated 16th September 1938, which has been placed at the disposal of the Press."

Alleged imposition of fine on an European and its subsequent reduction.

* 67 *Q.*—SRI RAO BAHADUR N. R. SAMIAPPA MUDALIYAR: Will the Hon. the Prime Minister be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that a fine of Rs. 500 was imposed on a European for an offence committed under the Prohibition Act, which was subsequently reduced to Rs.

[12th December 1938

(b) if so, what is the nature of the offence which he committed and the section of the Prohibition Act which he offered thereby; and

(c) by whom the fine was imposed and by whom the fine was reduced?

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARIAR :—" (a) The answer is in the affirmative.

" (b) & (c) He was convicted under section 4 (i) (a) of the Prohibition Act by the Subdivisional First-class Magistrate of Sankari for importing three bottles of whisky into the prohibited area. On 14th October 1937 shortly after prohibition came into force in the Salem district the accused's father who was residing in Salem district applied for a permit under section 20 of the Act. A permit was duly issued on 20th November 1937. The conviction was for the despatch to him of three bottles of whisky in the interval on 10th November 1937 as a birthday present from his son from outside the district. The offence was technical and the fine was therefore reduced by Government."

SRI B. NARAYANASWAMI NAYUDU :—" May I ask if the fine imposed was not technical? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARIAR :—" I do not quite understand the joke; the offence is technical, the hon. Member will agree."

SRI B. NARAYANASWAMI NAYUDU :—" May I know whether this is not a substantial offence, which the Government is trying its utmost to put down? "

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARIAR :—" The man who was fined had applied for a permit and he got it within the first fortnight of the introduction of prohibition; in the interval, his son sent him a birthday present from outside the district; that was therefore a technical offence."

Lands, if any, that can be brought under cultivation and appointment of necessary staff for working out the cost.

* 68 Q.—SRI V. V. JOGAYYA PANTULU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that during the last year there was an increase in the acreage of cultivation in this Presidency; if so, what is the extent of the increase;

(b) whether this increase, if any, resulted in an increase of revenue; if so, to what extent; and

(c) whether there are still vast areas, which could be brought under cultivation with increased irrigational facilities; if so, whether any steps are taken to estimate the extent of these areas; if not, whether Government propose to take steps to appoint an